

9100. Adulteration and misbranding of santal oil. U. S. * * * v. 500 * * * 10 Minims, * * * and 900 Soluble Elastic Capsules, of Santal Oil, 5 Minims * * *. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. No. 10834. I. S. Nos. 15860-r, 15861-r. S. No. E-1639.)

On August 6, 1919, the United States attorney for the Southern District of West Virginia, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the District Court of the United States for said district a libel for the seizure and condemnation of 500 soluble elastic capsules, 10 minims, and 900 soluble elastic capsules, 5 minims, more or less, of santal oil, at Charleston, W. Va., alleging that the article had been shipped on July 17, 1918, by the Evans Drug Mfg. Co., Greensburg, Pa., and transported from the State of Pennsylvania into the State of West Virginia, and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part, "Santal Oil East India, 10 Min.," and "Sandalwood Oil East India 5 Min."

Analysis of a sample of the article by the Bureau of Chemistry of this department showed that the contents of the capsules consisted of a mixture containing more than 70 per cent of cottonseed oil.

Adulteration of the article was alleged in the libel for the reason that it was sold under and by a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopœia and differed from the standard of strength, quality, and purity as determined by the tests therein laid down, and for the further reason that said article fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold, in strength and purity.

Misbranding was alleged in substance for the reason that the branding and labeling of the article was false for the further reason that by virtue of the statements contained on the labels of said article it was an imitation of another article, and was offered for sale under the name of another article.

On November 29, 1919, no claimant having appeared for the property, judgment of condemnation and forfeiture was entered, and it was ordered by the court that the product be destroyed by the United States marshal.

E. D. BALL, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.